



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,861	08/04/2003	Shin-Ichi Nakao	116772	4617
25944	7590	01:25/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			LE, HOA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/632,861	Applicant(s) NAKAO ET AL	
	Examiner H. T. Le	Art Unit 1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,9-11 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,9-11 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 3, 4, 7, 9-11, and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is confusing as it appears that both the “grafted polymers” and the “inclusion” in the solution filled in the pores of the functional particle, but it’s unclear where the grafted polymers and the inclusion are relatively to each other in the functional particle. Are they both impregnated in the pores? Or are the grafted polymers on the surface while the inclusion is contained in the inner pores (this scenario seems to be suggested through the drawings but not so clear in the claim). The 6th paragraph (lines 15-17) of the claim is confusing because of what appears to be a grammatical error; that is subject-verb disagreement. It is unclear what is “shrunk or hydrophilic”. If it is the grafted polymers (as described in the instant specification), “is” should be changed to “are”. Same deficiency is found at the 8th paragraph (lines 20-21). It is also unclear as to the relationship between the “inclusion-impregnated functional particle” and the subject matter of the claim, the “functional particle”. In addition, it’s unclear how the inclusion becomes “inserted” or “impregnated” in the particle.

The preamble of claim 4 is somewhat confusing. It’s unclear what “having graft polymerization yield” means. Line 3, it’s unclear what is “controlled by adjusting a reduced pressure”. The rest of the claim is totally confusing. If this is meant to be a product-by-

process claim (as it appears to be), it is suggested that the phrase “obtained by a process comprising” (or similar language) be employed and process steps be subsequently recited for clarity.

In claim 7, for clarity, it is suggested that the process steps be affirmatively recited in active voice instead of having them in passive voice as here. the phrase “said plasmas irradiated particle is soaked in a monomer solution” would have been clearer if converted to active voice such as “soaking said plasma irradiated particle in a monomer solution”.

Same suggestion is applied to claims 9 and 10.

In claims 17 and 18, “high density” and “low density” render the claims indefinite because “high” and “low” are relative terms and there’s no basis to ascertain the metes and bounds of “high” and “low” density.

Claims 19 and 20 suffer the same deficiency of claims 17 and 18.

Claims 21 and 22 are unclear.

Other claims are deemed indefinite in view of their dependency upon claim 3 or 4.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



H. T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773
